2178STIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 3 4 5 IRVING STITSKY, 6 7 8 New York, N.Y. January 7, 2002 11:45 a.m. 9 10 Before: 11 HON. ALLEN G. SCHWARTZ. 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 MARY JO WHITE United States Attorney for the 15 Southern District of New York JAY MUSOFF 16 Assistant United States Attorney 17 ROGER BENNET ADLER 18 Attorney for Defendant 19 20 21 22 23 24

Sen	t	en	C	е
-----	---	----	---	---

	Sentence
1	(Case called)
2	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your names
3	for the record.
4	MR. MUSOFF: Good morning. Jay Musoff for the
5	government.
6	MR. ADLER: Good morning, your Honor. Roger Bennet
7	Adler, 225 Broadway, New York, New York, for defendant Irving
8	Stitsky, present before the court.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Adler, are you and your client
10	prepared for sentence today?
11	MR. ADLER: We are, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: You and Mr. Stitsky have each read the
13	presentence report, correct?
L4	MR. ADLER: We have.
L5	THE COURT: You have either noted or had the
L6	opportunity to note any comment or objection you had to the
L7	contents of the report?
L8	MR. ADLER: Yes.
L9	THE COURT: I also have received from you, Mr. Adler,
20	your submission dated December 20, 2001, including the
21	Exhibits A through D, I have the government's letter,
22	Mr. Musoff's letter, that's dated January 2, 2002, and I also
3	have your letter dated January 2, 2002 and the letter that you
24	faxed to me Friday dated January 4, 2002. I want you to know

25 | that I have read all of those materials and all the exhibits

Sentence

1 annexed to them.

Do you wish to be heard on behalf of Mr. Stitsky?

3 MR. ADLER: I do.

THE COURT: Would you please approach the microphone.

MR. ADLER: Thank you, your Honor. If it please the court, in the autumn of 1995, efforts which began in the summer of that year to initiate a business venture with Paul Burton, which is to say the opening of an OSJ branch of Monitor Securities, began to move forward.

We are here today because during the life of Monitor Securities and DMN, bribes were paid, stocks were promoted, and investors were victimized by those brokerage concerns. The indictment and paragraph 130, on, I believe, page 22 of the PSI report confirms that the primary role that my client, Irving Stitsky, played in connection with those activities was in response to the need for stockbrokers to work at Monitor, to get the word out, and, indeed, he recruited pursuant to that agreement and understanding a number of brokers, two of whom are significant for sentencing purposes here today. They are Mark Burton, not to be confused with Paul Burton, and Mark Burton's partner, colleague, Ken Fuina. My comments will be limited as to them. I am mindful that the court will deal with that situation at another time and, most significantly, under different circumstances.

However, during the period of time that Mark Burton

2178STIS

Sentence

and Ken Fuina, who got their jobs on the recommendation of
Irving Stitsky, became involved in representing a client named
Gary Fettman, and during the period of time that's relevant to
the sentence your Honor will impose this morning, unbeknownst
to Gary Fettman, the brokerage house and Mark Burton and Ken
Fuina received various bribes, various inducements, which were
not disclosed insofar as they relate to two entities that are
the subject of sentencing here today, International Nursing,
which was involved in the summer of 1995, more than six years
ago, and another entity called Beach Port.

Confining myself to the terms of the plea agreement which permit me to call facts to your attention but go no further as an advocate for Mr. Stitsky, let me simply say that the PSI report represents to your Honor, and the chart is found at paragraph 125, at pages 20 to 21 of the PSI report, that Mr. Stitsky received approximately \$57,000 in connection with these activities at Monitor over a period of several months, and the stipulated range of relevant conduct as presented to the court is between 800,000 and 1,500,000.

In terms of the figures for both Ken Fuina and Mark Burton, they are significantly lower, and I call the court's attention to that in the PSI report. I urge the court to consider the figures in determining an appropriate guideline range.

The second topic I would like to speak to, the second

Sentence

2.2

and final, deals with extraordinary family circumstances. With the court's permission, the court is aware the audience in this courtroom is filled today with family members of the Stitsky family. There is one individual whom I would, if the court will permit him to speak briefly to this issue because I would like to speak about it, but I think that as the famous saying went, "from the mouths of babes," Irving's eldest son, Jarrett Stitsky, who is here during intercession between the fall and spring semesters from the University of Miami where he earned an academic scholarship following his graduation from Jericho High School in June of 2001, I believe can speak most poignantly to the circumstances.

THE COURT: Mr. Adler, let me interrupt you to say that I have read his letter and I have read all of the letters, and the letters written by the children are, to put it mildly, poignant and significant, and I sympathize with them, but I don't intend to hear the children speak today, including Jarrett. I expect that you will speak and say whatever there is to be said with regard to this issue.

MR. ADLER: Yes, sir.

As the court is aware from the probation report that Mr. Steele has prepared, the parties were divorced but in an unusual situation, and there are many unusual circumstances that exist in the affairs of men and women in our society today, they live together in the Muttontown residence, which

Sentence

is to say, Andrea and Irving and the children. And Jarrett, who is here today, up until he left for school in August to attend the University of Miami, lived in the home until that time. He is back there now during intercession.

Irving resided in the home and I think can best be described, as the letters from not merely the defendant's children but, I hate to use the word strangers, but I will call them strangers in the sense that teachers, principals, others who interacted with Mr. Stitsky for years in terms of him being the primary caregiver, the primary individual within the Stitsky family, who ensured that the tasks of growing up were approached in a focused way as best as he could.

The reason that I had asked the court to permit

Jarrett to speak was not to make the job of judging more

difficult than it already is. I have no doubt, knowing you

professionally as I do, that this has got to be the worst part

of the job, and I don't mean that in a flippant way. But

particularly of late, and when I use the term "particularly of

late," I mean particularly in the last several months, in the

fall of 2001, and particularly into the holiday period, the

inability of Andrea Stitsky to cope with her responsibilities,

manifested by an apparent alcohol, an apparent drug problem,

she is, as I understand it, currently being interviewed today

by an arm of the court in Nassau County called TASC, whose

function is to advise the court about possible drug abuse

2178STIS

Sentence

programs, particularly for people who can benefit from forms
of rehabilitation in the areas to which I spoke.

My purpose in raising this is not to shift focus from Irving to something else. This is not a variation on the dog ate the homework type of an excuse. It is simply to call to the court's attention an unusual circumstance that exists and has existed and has accelerated to exist over the last several months, and particularly the last several weeks, that the children have been confronted with that goes beyond what I will call the ordinary family circumstances that a family is required to cope with when a defendant is convicted of a crime and faces a term of incarceration.

One of the troubles that I have with the somewhat clinical approach that the Probation Department has taken is that it is detached from, to the point that it has not consisted of interviews with the children and a development of the facts that I think put meat on the proverbial bones for the court to assess the nature and circumstances of why this is extraordinary, meaning not ordinary.

The two remaining children who live at home, Eliza who is age 10 -- Eliza, can you stand up for a minute? Thank you. Brett, are you here? Jarrett, are you here? Thank you -- have lived under these difficult circumstances. I feel it is important for the court to factor them in in an appropriate way.

Sentence

1.5

I am not seeking to trivialize the offense conduct. I am not seeking to trivialize or divert attention away from the court's function here today. But as I noted in my final letter to the court on January 4, referencing the court to a recent Law Review article that your colleague John Martin published in the Brooklyn Law Review, The Need for Measured Departures under Appropriate Circumstances, whether it's a significant departure or something more in the nip-and-tuck departure, I think it is called for in this case.

I call the court's attention, and I am now proceeding to the final portion of my presentation, to the fact that the Probation report tells us that the combined earnings, illicit earnings of Mark Burton and Ken Fuina are in the range of \$70,000 to \$120,000. I call the court's attention to the fact that if the court were to add to that figure the moneys that Mr. Stitsky earned during the period of time that we are talking about, the court would be at the guideline range of less than 350,000, but more than 200,000. It would be a step up of eight guideline levels in the 2F1.1 total for a net offense level of 13 and a guideline range of not less than 12 months nor more than 18 months.

I urge the court to temper justice with mercy in sentencing my client Irving Stitsky here today.

I know Mr. Stitsky wanted to address the court at the appropriate time.

Sentence

THE COURT: Mr. Stitsky, do you wish to be heard?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You may also approach the microphone if you wish.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like to start off by making a number of an apologies. First to the court for the time needed to conclude this case. Next to the government for the expenses imposed on them in order to complete the case. And last but not least to my family, my loved ones, who depended on me and I let down.

The fact that I went into a business venture with Jeff Pokross and his associates and received a total of \$57,000 over a period of a few months while I waited for my license to clear, so I hoped run a branch office for them, and then later realized this money was for the brokers I referred who bought and sold their stocks. It was wrong and I am sorry for that. After my license didn't clear, I went on to a different business. Today I realize that no matter how much money is involved, it's not worth the sacrifices that come with it.

To jeopardize my children and their well-being, to create this mental anguish for my parents and my sisters, I can't apologize enough. I have not only exposed myself to a sentence imposed by this court, but I have sentenced them as well, and for this I am truly sorry.

_

Sentence

Your Honor, my children are my life and they depend on me day to day, almost hour to hour, and I have clearly let them down. During these past six months while incarcerated at MDC, I have helplessly witnessed my family fall apart. I truly believe that if I was there, even under home confinement, I could have prevented a lot of what has happened. I have seen my mother age and become ill due to the stress caused by an investment into a retail optical business where I worked six to seven days a week. My mother took a loan to help me and, unfortunately, misrepresentations of financials were made and a tremendous amount of money was lost. The way I handled myself in that situation was wrong, and for that I am sorry.

I have witnessed my former wife Andrea completely self-destruct and deteriorate by her abusive use of alcohol and drugs, her desire to patronize bars and local Long Island singles hangouts and be a part of a whole new social life. This has had a negative impact on her responsibilities to our children, as well as her daily responsibilities of a homemaker. She's tried to work at two different jobs and has failed and been let go. My children have visited me at MDC and cried to me that they need me not just because they miss their father, because they need parental guidance and some form of discipline, someone they can count on during troubled times.

Sentence

My 20-year-old daughter, Shara, who is on her way to recovery from abusive drug use by going to NA and AA has had a terrible time since my incarceration. Her relationship with her mother has almost become a competitive environment. Her mother's desire to socialize with her daughter's friends to the point of dating some of her own daughter's ex-boyfriends has sent my daughter into a rebellious frizzy which has caused her to face the courts of Nassau County and be ordered into a rehabilitation program.

My 10-year-old daughter Eliza finds herself in an awkward position. She's not sure if she's the mom or the child. If she's not nursing her mother through one of her episodes, she's lying awake worried if or even when her mother is coming home from a night out. These frequent escapades have forced her own 16-year-old son to act as her daughter's parent helping with homework and getting her off to school in the morning. This behavior has caused her to miss an inordinate amount of school and has jeopardized her education.

My 16-year-old son Brett is a junior in high school who has become completely withdrawn since my incarceration.

He went from a B plus student to barely passing. And finally, he is finding his teenage time disappearing because he is looking after his sister or mother and worried about them both, all of which I believe will have a dramatic impact on his future and growth as a young man.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS (212) 805-0300

1.8

Sentence

1.8

2.4

My 18-year-old son Jarrett is a freshman at the University of Miami on an academic scholarship. He has recently suffered a near fatal accident which has hospitalized him for two weeks and he is currently requiring extensive rehabilitation. Due to his mother's recent neglect, he has not been to his required follow-up visits, which if I was there I know he would be looked after. He just recently told me he was taking a leave of absence from school so he can help at home. This alone has broken my heart since I know how he

Your Honor, my time at MDC and the recent events of September 11 have allowed me to assess life from a completely different perspective. Certain things that I took for granted should and will be looked at a lot closer and much more carefully and appreciated a lot more, kind of a wake-up call to see what is important and what is really not.

It made me realize that the postulate "crime does not pay" says a lot, and the true meaning means more to me than anything. I have learned that your freedom and ability to make choices regardless of your financial wherewithal, be it rich or poor, is truly a most valuable commodity a person possesses. To be with your family in the privacy of your own home, having dinner together, able to discuss the events of the day, just being there to enjoy the good and help with the bad, moments like when you authorized me yourself to travel

Sentenc
Sem em

with my boy's high school basketball team to a tournament in Florida, those are the moments treasured the most. These are the times and moments that are worth more than any amount of money you can ever make.

This time at MDC has also extended me the opportunity to reflect upon my future. How can I afford to support my children in a lawful manner and hope to make a positive difference? I would like to continue my education so I may work with teenage children and possibly help guide them from right and wrong and maybe just, maybe can save one child from making the terrible mistakes I have.

So, your Honor, I am asking you here today, no, sir, I am begging you, that you will impose the lightest possible sentence based on all the circumstances so I may complete my time and get back to my children and start this new life.

Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Musoff, anything you wish to say?

MR. MUSOFF: Yes, your Honor.

Let me first address Mr. Adler's comments briefly regarding the loss amount.

THE COURT: Why don't you also go to the microphone so everyone can hear you.

MR. MUSOFF: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, first turning to Mr. Adler's comments regarding the loss amount, I don't think it's at all disputed

Sentence

that the stipulated loss amount in this case is between \$800,000 and \$1.5 million, and it's clear that that number is not the sum total of the bribes paid to either Mr. Stitsky or the brokers he has recruited but that is the value of the benefit conferred upon DMN Capital and its partners for the securities transactions that those brokers were recruited to engage in.

It needs to be clear, your Honor, that Mr. Stitsky had come from Stratton Oakmont, and I don't believe it's disputed that securities fraud was rampant. He was later barred from the industry based on his conduct at Stratton Oakmont and then he and his partner Paul Burton were tasked with recruiting these sorts of brokers, primarily from Stratton Oakmont, to perpetrate securities fraud at a new firm, Monitor Investment and Associates. So Monitor was created for the sole purpose of engaging in securities fraud.

After his brief association with Monitor, I don't believe it is disputed that he continued to engage in securities fraud, and he was convicted of that conduct before the Eastern District which he awaits sentencing on.

So unless your Honor has any questions regarding how the loss amount was calculated, and I believe it's stipulated, the fact that he personally received an amount less doesn't factor at all into the offense guidelines calculation. But if your Honor sees fit to view it in terms of where within the

2178STIS 15

Sentence

sentencing range, the government does want to point out that

Mr. Stitsky enjoyed a position in the Monitor firm above that

of his brokers. So he was in relationship with the DMN

Capital partners and he, in turn, recruited these brokers. To

the extent the brokers have a limited role, that is because it

was Mr. Stitsky who stood as the one who had the relation with

DMN Capital and he in turn was the one who was organizing

Monitor along the same fraudulent lines as Stratton Oakmont.

Turning to what I believe is the main argument today, which is whether a downward departure based on family circumstances is appropriate, as it is clear, the disruption of a defendant's family life is an obvious and an unavoidable consequence of incarceration. The fact that a defendant's family life will be disrupted and that truly innocent victims, meaning the defendant's children, may be affected alone is not grounds for a downward departure. While I don't believe the government has been bottom feeding, as I believe was characterized in the most recent letter to the court, I believe it is clear that even single parents whose children are placed in foster care repeatedly courts have found that is not an extraordinary family circumstance. Here it's a two-parent household and the children certainly are not being placed in foster care.

The other thing that the government pointed out in its letters, these are not incredibly young children. Granted

2.0

Sentence

the youngest is 10 years old, but the others are either in high school or the oldest are 18 and 20 years old. They are in college. So it's a situation of extremely young children left at home.

I think the thrust of the government's response truly deals with the fact that this defendant's family is fortunate enough to have the support of, as they call it themselves, a tight-knit and supportive family. This is a situation where both sets of grandparents are involved. The defendant's wife's parents, as well as the defendant's mother, and I believe his father has passed away, his stepfather are all enormously supportive, supportive both emotionally and, as set forth in the PSI, they have given hundreds of thousands of dollars over the year to support the defendant's family.

In addition, closer to home, the defendant also has two sisters who are also enormously supportive, and it appears that the defendant's children's aunts and uncles stand ready and willing to continue to provide that support to their nieces and nephews and they, too, have provided tens if not hundreds of thousands of dollars to this defendant's family.

I think it needs to be noted, your Honor, that the defendant's family does enjoy a lifestyle quite unusual to many other defendant's families. As pointed out in the PSI, I believe at paragraph 177, the defendant lives in a six-bedroom home on three acres in an affluent section of Long Island.

support to his family.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2178STIS 17

Sentence

They have a three-car garage, tennis court and swimming pool. 1 This lifestyle continues to be enjoyed by them. They suffer 2 obviously somewhat because the defendant is not able to 3 provide any financial support, but it appears they continue to 4 5 live in this home and enjoy clearly an above-average lifestyle. Maybe not the lifestyle they were accustomed to 6 7 when the defendant was making \$2 million when he was working at Stratton Oakmont, but as we all know, Stratton Oakmont was 8 9 engaged in securities fraud. I think it needs to be pointed 10 out that this defendant over the years has not provided legitimate financial support to his family, he has engaged in 11 securities fraud, and by that means he has provided financial 12

Finally, your Honor, when the defendant appeared to have engaged in a line of business other than securities fraud, when he entered into a business arrangement with his mother involving Sterling Optical stores, that too was tinged by criminal activity.

As your Honor knows, this summer the defendant was remanded into custody because the defendant physically threatened the individual who had loaned money for the purchase of these stores. This was supposed to be the defendant turning a new leaf, in a legitimate business.

Instead, the defendant brings along two men to threaten this person with physical injury if he continued in pursuing what

2178STIS
Sentence

was a legitimate business loan to the defendant. Throughout, this defendant has engaged in criminal activity such as to support the family's lifestyle.

The other point I want to turn to is something that has been commented on much by Mr. Adler in his submissions, is that while it appears that the defendant's wife does suffer from substance abuse problems, the defendant too has his own substance abuse problems. I am not saying that this somehow makes him a better or worse father. The letters of support speak for themselves. But this court should take notice that the defendant has his own set of substance abuse problems, that he himself has been abusing drugs on and off for the past 25 years, including cocaine, Quaaludes, Ectasy and alcohol. The defendant has never completed a rehabilitation program and it's unclear what sort of treatment and what his current status is with respect to that substance abuse and how that would affect his parental duties.

So, in sum, all these cases, your Honor, with respect to family circumstances obviously portray families disrupted and suffering, for what in this case the children's father has done and brought upon himself. But in this case, your Honor, these children enjoy a supportive family that provides emotional and financial support, and this case, unlike even cases where single parents are incarcerated and their children are left as wards of the state, these children will not suffer

downward departure.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2178STIS 19

Sentence

a fate even close to that. For those reasons, your Honor, this is not an extraordinary case that warrants any sort of

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question, Mr. Musoff.

You have asked the court to set a date within 90 days after sentencing for purposes of setting restitution in this case, correct?

MR. MUSOFF: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: How far advanced are you in the exercise of putting together your restitution request?

I have spoken to my colleagues who are MR. MUSOFF: also involved in this case with the other codefendants and my understanding is that since the terrorist attacks in the World Trade Center, the SEC documents with respect to this case were destroyed. With respect to the restitution portion, I understand that they are putting it together through alternate means, and the government would request, and I have spoken to Mr. Adler, that a date be set some 45 or 60 days from today. I expect to have a number which I would like to discuss with Mr. Adler two weeks before the sentencing date, so hopefully, your Honor, Mr. Adler and the government can discuss what is the appropriate and accurate restitution amount and we can come to the court prepared at that time with hopefully an undisputed amount. The government would respectfully request a date set 60 days from now.

Sentence

THE COURT: I understand.

Let me ask you this. Have you done anything with regard to listing how many victims there were?

MR. MUSOFF: Yes, your Honor. It's my understanding, because we have limited for purposes of this plea agreement the victims, the victims are the customers of the two brokers that Mr. Adler mentioned, Mark Burton and Ken Fuina. It's my understanding there were only two primary customers and one main customer and that that customer's losses were approximately \$800,000. So it's not a multitude of victims. We are trying to assess more the value of the loss than the number of victims.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Adler, you were on your feet. Did you want to say something?

MR. ADLER: Just briefly and simply factually by way of clarification.

Irving Stitsky was not an officer or had any equity interest in Monitor or any of those companies. The brokers that were recruited, as the indictment alleged and indeed as the allocution confirmed, went to work and received their instructions and made their decisions concerning what they did and why they did it and how they conformed to SEC regulations without the guiding hands of Irving Stitsky.

Accordingly, to the extent, particularly where the

Sentence

one individual who has been identified, Mr. Fettman, became a customer of Burton and Fuina afterwards, the court has already heard, and indeed the probation report has reported on how Burton and Fuina's loss total is computed, or gain total, I guess I should say, because the basis is bribery, I ask the court to keep that in mind particularly where the Probation Department talks about the fairness and equity.

Lastly, in terms of lifestyle and extraordinary family circumstances, the house that you have heard about was contemplated to be sold. Attempts have been made to sell it to get Florence Nathan, who is Irving's mom, to recoup the moneys and to take her off the mortgage. The house, as I understand, is currently in foreclosure and attempts have been made, none of it has been helpful because of the downturn in the economy result of the events of September 11, but this house will probably end up, at best, as a break-even proposition and the family will only know, and a lot of this has been delayed, as I understand it, in order to see what is going to happen in terms of the sentencing.

In terms of Sterling Optical, I think it's a tragic situation that the perceptions were that the seller of the stores that took back notes had been less than candid with regard to credit card receipts and the like. It clearly was -- and that's why it was prosecuted as a 1001 violation and not in any other significant way. It was recognized as a

1.2

2.0

Sentence

spontaneous and unfortunate response to the perception that
his mom was being ripped off and not for other continuation of
any form of criminality, although he has accepted
responsibility for his role completely in that situation and
will be sentenced before Judge Seidler because of it.

However, I would point out this is a defendant who understands the work ethic. He was working some 60-plus hours a week to learn the business. I know he was learning the business. He was prepared and indeed that manifested a recognition that the securities field was certainly a field that was no longer appropriate to have any involvement in.

To the extent that the court imposes a sentence today and reserves on the issue of restitution for the reasons the government has made clear, just to comment on that, I indicated to Mr. Musoff it might be most helpful for the court if the government were able to make 45 days as an approximation. If they will get me those figures, I will confer with --

THE COURT: Mr. Musoff indicates that's what he has indicated.

MR. ADLER: I want you to know we have spoken about it, and in order to make the job less adversarial and more collegial, if we can agree, we will. If we can agree in part, we will. We will come back at some other time for that housekeeping portion of the case.

2178STIS 23

α					
<u>_</u>	en	$r \sim$	רדב	~~	

I do believe that the circumstances here are
extraordinary. Some people when they think about departures
believe that a lawyer is asking the court to impose a
noncustodial sentence. That's not what this approach is
about. I think that there is a family and the family is doing
what it can under difficult circumstances. I am simply saying
that a measured departure, which is not insignificant, that's
why I called the court's attention to the combined loss totals
or the combined gain totals because I think that is a figure
that the court can rely upon should it be so inclined, could
point the way towards tempering justice with mercy. It sends
the message that conduct of this kind will not be tolerated
and victims will be protected, at the same time it also sends
a message that we cannot turn our backs on our children who
are the next generation. Again, I ask the court to temper
justice with mercy.
THE COURT: Any legal reason why sentence should not

THE COURT: Any legal reason why sentence should not now be imposed?

MR. ADLER: No, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Musoff?

MR. MUSOFF: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: The defendant may remain seated.

The defendant, Irving Stitsky, has pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement to Count 5 and Count 7 of the indictment to the crimes of conspiracy to commit

2.2

are Class D felonies.

2178STIS 24

Sentence

securities fraud, wire fraud, and to use interstate facilities
to commit commercial bribery, both of which crimes are
punishable under 18 United States Code, Section 371, and they

These two counts under the sentencing guidelines are grouped, and the base offense level for these crimes as set forth in 2F1.1(a) of the guidelines is 6, to which there are added 11 levels as a result of the fact that the value of the improper benefit to be conferred in return for the bribes received by Mr. Stitsky was more than \$800,000 but less than \$1.5 million. The offense level is also increased by two levels because these crimes involved more than minimal planning. There was more than one victim.

The result of these increases is to place the adjusted offense level at 19. Mr. Stitsky has accepted responsibility for his crimes and, therefore, is entitled to a three-level reduction, which places the total offense level at 16.

He is in Criminal History Category I, a most favorable Criminal History Category. As a result, his guideline imprisonment range is 21 months to 27 months; his guideline supervised release range is two to three years; probation is not authorized under the sentencing guidelines at these levels; his guideline fine range is \$5,000 to \$50,000; and there is a mandatory special assessment of \$100 per count

Sentence

for a total of \$200.

The defendant has noted objections to the presentence report and these are adequately addressed at page 31 of the presentence report. The defendant has submitted substantial materials from his family, friends, others, with regard to his character, his involvement with his children, the difficulties that his family experiences, the need to have the defendant with his children. It's a complicated set of circumstances here.

The substance of this case, going back to the case itself, is that the defendant participated in what are called pump-and-dump schemes as a registered representative, and he also recruited certain stockbrokers to the firm, which has been mentioned, Monitor, from November 1995 through March of 1996, who would receive secret, undisclosed bribes for recommending certain securities to their retail clients, and Monitor was most recently controlled by DMN Capital which paid the bribes to the defendant and others.

The facts of this case I think ought to be more specifically laid out on the record here and so I am going to refer to what has been provided in the presentence report and in the government's letter, Mr. Musoff's letter dated January 2 and, in part, in the submissions made by Mr. Adler on behalf of Mr. Stitsky.

In substance, going back to 1995, DMN Capital, which

Sentence

was a financial advisory firm that was corrupt -- it was
founded as a joint venture of the five La Cosa Nostra crime
families in New York -- orchestrated a series of stock
manipulation schemes that fraudulently induced investors at
numerous brokerage firms into buying certain securities by, as
I have described, among other fraudulent means, paying secret
bribes to stockbrokers to cause their retail customers to buy
and hold certain securities. In connection with its
fraudulent scheme, DMN Capital controlled various brokerage
firms, including Monitor Investment Group, the firm that's
being mentioned here.

The DMN firm recruited certain stockbrokers to work at Monitor through an agreement with Mr. Stitsky and his partner Mr. Burton, Paul Burton, whereby Stitsky and Burton arranged for several licensed and unlicensed brokers to work at Monitor and receive secret, undisclosed bribes for what the government calls aggressively pushing certain securities. I don't have to go through the names of the companies.

Mr. Stitsky recruited many of these brokers from another fraudulent place, Stratton Oakmont, where fraudulent sales practices had been used. Mr. Stitsky from August 1990 to July 1995 had been employed by Stratton Oakmont, which was a boiler room operation, and there he was making up to \$2 million a year.

In August of 1998, Mr. Stitsky was barred by the

1.7

2178STIS 27

Sentence

Securities and Exchange Commission from association with any broker-dealer investment company, investment advisory or municipal securities dealer because of his alleged involvement

Now having left Stratton Oakmont, he was employed by Monitor, and at Monitor recruited many of the brokers that were at Monitor, which was this fraudulent operation. He recruited them from Stratton Oakmont and from other places where fraudulent sales practices were used.

with securities fraud associated with Stratton Oakmont.

Then, as I referred earlier, the secret bribes were paid to the brokers who had been recruited by Mr. Stitsky and these bribes were calculated on the basis of the total volume of certain securities purchased and held by those brokers' retail customers.

This case is a very serious case. Mr. Stitsky is one defendant out of 26 defendants in the case before me, and there are several other cases in this court involving approximately the same number of defendants in this massive securities fraud scheme.

The fact is that Mr. Stitsky, as I pointed out, has pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement. This is a negotiated plea. He pleaded guilty to two counts that I have referred to. He stipulated in the written plea agreement that he signed, and Mr. Stitsky is a sophisticated business person, he stipulated that the improper benefit conferred in return

2.2

2178STIS 28

Sentence

for the bribes which were paid to the brokers that he recruited exceeded \$800,000. He further stipulated that this improper benefit referred to the value of the securities transactions which were affected in return for the bribes paid to these brokers and to Mr. Stitsky.

Mr. Stitsky, in addition to the fact that he has the Stratton Oakmont situation and this situation, has also pled guilty to one count of securities fraud in connection with his indictment in the Eastern District of New York, in Brooklyn, and Long Island, and that offense related to a separate conspiracy to manipulate securities in at least eight companies for his own benefit in connection with fraudulent representations made to an Internet company.

He also pled guilty in the Eastern District court, federal court, to charges relating to threatening an individual with physical injury if that individual attempted to collect a legitimate business debt from Mr. Stitsky. He pled guilty to one count of making false statements to the government when he was subsequently questioned about the event. In other words, Mr. Stitsky, even though he is in Criminal History Category I, has a, I will call it, checkered history. He presents a very sympathetic case for a downward departure, and specifically he claims that his wife is unfit to care for his children due to her abuse of alcohol and drugs and, what is clearly implicit in these papers, her substantial

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2178STIS 29

Sentence

emotional problems. He says that his family circumstances are extraordinary and that, given the circumstances that he finds himself in and his children are in, that the court ought to downwardly depart from the guidelines, the sentencing guidelines, which dictate a sentence within a specific sentence range.

The sentencing quidelines make reference to family ties and responsibilities in Section 5H1.6 as follows. Family ties and responsibilities and community ties states: are not ordinarily relevant in determining whether a sentence In fact, should be outside the applicable guideline range. the cases indicate that family circumstances are a discouraged basis for departure, and the reason is obvious, that defendants who have families, who have children, who appear before the court on sentence, are commonly in a situation where the family is seriously adversely affected by the removal of a parent from the home. This is a circumstance that courts and judges deal with every day of the year in courts throughout the United States. It's a reason why judges, contrary to what people in the public may believe, find sentencing so difficult and, in fact, painful.

In this case, the defendant has a difficult case to make because he has four children who are not infants. It's true that the youngest of the children is 10, but he has children who are age 20, 18 and 16, children who have already

Sentence

moved along through their childhood into young adulthood. The sentencing guidelines indicate that a downward departure certainly can be granted if the factor that is presented to the court, in this case extraordinary family circumstances, is presented to an exceptional degree or in some other way makes the case different from the ordinary case where the factor is present.

There really has to be exceptional and extraordinary circumstances. The mere disruption of the defendant's life and the resulting effect on those who are dependent on the defendant is in fact, as I indicated, inherent in the punishment of incarceration for all defendants who appear before this court, and courts have spent a great deal of time, districts courts and circuit courts, in analyzing these circumstances, and the singular question to be addressed is whether the case is outside the heartland of the cases that appear before the court.

In this case we have a complexion of facts which indicate the following: The children in Mr. Stitsky's household are, without doubt, significantly older than those cases in which downward departures commonly are granted. It is the experience of this court and other judges of this court and courts throughout the United States that not uncommonly single parents, women whose children are going into foster care, appear before this court and courts viewing these cases

1.5

2.2

2178STIS 31

Sentence

and the volume of them have occasionally downwardly departed
but have looked to the entirety of the circumstances to see
what else the family consists of and what else is available
for the children and who else can be looked to to step in in
the place of the defendant before the court. And parsing
these cases, it is clear to me, again as I indicated a few
moments ago, that under the test of whether this case is
outside the heartland or extraordinary or unique, I don't
think that the defendant can establish that, and I find that
this case is not outside the heartland and, in my discretion
would decline to downwardly depart and do so for these
reasons.

In this case, unlike many other cases, and notwithstanding my acceptance of what has been stated with regard to Mr. Stitsky, this defendant, unlike many, many other defendants, have other family members who are available and who have stepped in thus far to provide support, emotional and financial support, to the children while Mr. Stitsky is incarcerated. In this particular case, as I review the facts here, it is clear that Mr. Stitsky has two sisters in this area, in the metropolitan area. He has two parents. He has Mr. Stitsky's two parents. These people have all been supportive and the indication is will continue to be in this tight-knit close family that is before us in the form of Mr. Stitsky, the father.

Sentence

Since 1995, Mr. Stitsky's sisters have already provided over \$80,000 in financial assistance to the family. Mr. Stitsky's mother and stepfather have provided both emotional and financial support for the family, as have the sisters, and they have provided, the mother and stepfather, more than \$200,000 to support the family. And Mr. Stitsky's in-laws, the parents of his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Minsky, have provided a quarter of a million dollars to the family since 1995.

I say this not to diminish the arguments made by the defendant so much as to point out that this case is different from so many other cases that are before us where a mother or father, the only person in the home, are about to be sentenced and don't have anyone out there to step forward and provide emotional and financial support for children.

In this case, as unfortunate and tragic as this case is, and it is, there are people in the family who have been and are available to provide emotional and financial support, and that, in my judgment, is a serious factor that removes this case from the argument that it is outside the heartland. It is a case that is not unique. It is in the heartland of cases. It is a case in which fortunately there are others who are available to provide the specific items for the children.

It is also interesting to me that this situation, in which the defendant and his wife are divorced, at least since

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS (212) 805-0300

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

33 2178STIS

Sentence

last March, finds the defendant and his wife living in the 1 same home with the children. Withdrawn. Finds his wife continues to live with the children in the same home they 3 lived in as husband and wife even though they had joint 4 custody, and that Mr. Stitsky has not yet, at least according 5 to what I have seen, made any application to a court for sole 6 custody of the children or at least sought to have his 7 children live with him rather than his wife despite all these 8 difficulties his wife is experiencing.

This is not to say that I am not sympathetic to the children. I am very sympathetic to the children, extremely, and I wish there was a way that I can find a solution to both sides of the equation that would not impact on the children as I know this sentence does.

Mr. Stitsky and his wife both, it seems to me, have problems with alcohol and drugs, which itself is a tragedy, and I think that both of them are in serious need of But that doesn't, again, change the facts that I have indicated, which are that this case is not outside the heartland of cases. This case is not uncommon. Parents who are being sentenced commonly come before this court with severe alcohol and drug abuse problems and the children are the affected parties.

The substance of this is that the court declines in its discretion to downwardly depart for extraordinary family

> (212) 805-0300 SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS

2178STIS 34

Sentence

circumstances because as serious as I find this case to be, this case is not outside the heartland of cases and is not to this court extraordinary.

The court also notes that the arguments that have been made by Mr. Adler, who has done a superb job for the defendant, by the way, require a response. Mr. Adler points out that Mr. Stitsky received only \$57,000 as his part of the payments that were made here. However, the fact is, as I indicated at the outset, there is a written plea agreement in this matter, in which it is said by the parties they agree that the improper benefit conferred in return for the bribes paid to the brokers that Mr. Stitsky recruited exceeded \$800,000, and the improper benefit referred to the value of the securities, referred to the value of the securities transactions which were effected in return for these bribes.

The fact is that Mr. Stitsky has agreed in his plea agreement not to seek a departure from the stipulated guidelines range on any grounds but the sole exception of his family circumstances, which I have now alluded to, and he further agreed he would not otherwise suggest a departure or adjustment was warranted. It is in the plea agreement.

The fact is under the sentencing guidelines, even if we accept, and I do accept Mr. Adler's argument that Mr. Stitsky had a benefit, a financial benefit personally of only \$57,000 rather than the stipulated amount of 800,000 to a

2178STIS Sentence

million and half, under the guidelines, and the defendant's individual profit is not the measure of the loss, because the fact is that Mr. Stitsky participated in a conspiracy, in a jointly undertaken activity that resulted in the stipulated loss amount of between 800,000 and a million and a half dollars. For sentencing purposes, under the guidelines, it is the improper benefit that was conferred in return for the bribes that is the loss amount that the court uses in calculating the guidelines. That's the law. That's also what the parties agreed to, and certainly we are dealing here with a sophisticated defendant and a very sophisticated and very experienced lawyer.

The net result of which is that I find that the guideline calculations that were made here in the presentence report and as stipulated to by the parties is correct and appropriate and I believe that they are the ones that should be applied and I do intend to apply them.

With all of this in mind, and recognizing that I have sentenced many defendants now in this 26-defendant case, some of whom have sentences which are well in excess of the sentences that are confronting Mr. Stitsky here, in trying to balance the sentencing considerations, I do now sentence Mr. Stitsky to the lowest level under the guidelines in this case and remand him to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 21 months, to be followed by a term of three

Sentence

years' supervised release. The supervised release is to be subject to the mandatory conditions that he not commit another federal state or local crime; that he not illegally possess a controlled substance; that he not possess a firearm or destructive device.

He is also subject to the standard conditions of supervision 1 through 13, with the special conditions that he provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information; that he not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless Mr. Stitsky is in compliance with the installment payment schedule.

He is to participate in a program approved by the United States Probation Office for substance abuse, which program may include testing to determine whether Mr. Stitsky has reverted to the use of drugs or alcohol. Mr. Stitsky will be required to contribute to the costs of services rendered as a copayment in an amount to be determined by the probation officer based on his ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment. He shall participate in an alcohol aftercare treatment program under a copayment plan which may include urine testing at the direction and discretion of the probation officer.

He is to report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours of his release from custody. His supervision

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS (212) 805-0300

Sentence

under the supervised release is to be conducted in the district of his residence.

I am not imposing any fine here because I do not find that he has the ability to pay a fine and also to pay the restitution, which will be set on a date to be set 60 days from now. I do impose, however, the mandatory assessment of \$200, \$100 on each count, which is due and payable immediately.

I am imposing this sentence in light of the considerations which are set forth in the law. That is, that the sentence address the seriousness of the crimes and deters the defendant and others and to protect the public.

There are outstanding counts. Are you requesting them to be dismissed?

MR. MUSOFF: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: That motion is granted.

The defendant has the right to appeal the sentence or any part thereof. Should he determine to do so, I ask you, Mr. Adler, if you're available, to assist him on any such appeal. If you are not available to assist him and he cannot afford counsel and he wishes to appeal, the court will appoint counsel to represent him free of charge.

In your letter to the court, Mr. Adler, you ask that the court make a recommendation, if it does sentence

Mr. Stitsky to incarceration, to make a recommendation to the

Sentence

Bureau of Prisons that Mr. Stitsky be permitted to serve his sentence at the Otisville facility.

MR. ADLER: Yes, Judge. I did so because there is a particular rabbi who I have had some dealings with and I just want to say that I found that his efforts in terms of dealing with defendants was proper and useful, and the defendant --

THE COURT: I am prepared to make the recommendation.

MR. ADLER: Thank you.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Particularly because I do want Mr. Stitsky to be in this area of the country, to be close to his children and maintain and continue to have contacts with his children that I think are critical to their needs and important to Mr. Stitsky's.

I will also say if the Bureau of Prisons measures how many people they have and what their needs are and capacities are, and they are not bound by the court's recommendation, I am going to also suggest if they don't have facility for him in Otisville that he be sentenced to a facility as close to the metropolitan area as possible where he can maintain contact with his children.

MR. ADLER: I appreciate that, Judge.

THE COURT: That is the sentence of the court.

Anything further, Mr. Adler?

MR. ADLER: I was just going to suggest purely by way of housekeeping, just looking for round dates, if, pursuant to

	Sentence
1	Mr. Musoff's information, if the government might be able to
2	get me some figures by the week of February 25. I didn't know
3	if the court wanted to select a date of perhaps Monday, March
4	18, as a target date, on the assumption whatever date Mr.
5	Musoff selected, the week of February 25, if that was
6	convenient for him, we can return to address the issue of
7	restitution.
8	THE COURT: Can we set this down for March 18?
9	MR. MUSOFF: With the convenience of the court and
10	Mr. Adler, if we can do it the week of March 11.
11	THE COURT: We will get the government to get the
12	papers by February 25 and we will put it down for March 11.
13	MR. ADLER: Yes, sir.
14	THE COURT: Let's make it March 11. Let's make it 11
15	o'clock on March 11.
16	MR. ADLER: Thank you, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Anything further?
18	MR. ADLER: No, sir.
19	MR. MUSOFF: No, your Honor. Thank you.
20	THE COURT: Thank you both.
21	(Adjourned)
22	
23	

24